

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 11, 2004 (Paper No. 10). Claims 17 to 31 are pending in the application, of which Claims 17, 22 and 27 are independent. Claims 17 to 19, 22 to 24 and 27 to 29 have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 17 to 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,341,166 (Garr). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns a controlled apparatus which is controlled by a remote control apparatus and receives a remote control signal transmitted from the remote control apparatus. The controlled apparatus selects either itself or a second controlled apparatus according to the remote control signal, and transmits a control command corresponding to the remote control signal to the second controlled apparatus if the second controlled apparatus is selected. In addition, an operating state of the second controlled apparatus is checked before the control command is transmitted to the second controlled apparatus. On the other hand, if the controlled apparatus is selected, the controlled apparatus is controlled according to the remote control signal.

One feature of the present invention therefore lies in checking an operating state of the second controlled apparatus before the control command is transmitted to the second controlled apparatus.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claims 17, 22 and 27 as amended respectively define the invention in terms of system, method and apparatus.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, the Garr patent is not seen to disclose or suggest checking an operating state of the second controlled apparatus before the control command is transmitted to the second controlled apparatus.

As understood by Applicant, Garr describes a control system in which a plurality of controlled devices 12, 16 and 20 is controlled using a single remote control apparatus 28. In this system, a remote control signal from the remote control apparatus is received by a decoder 26 and is converted into a control signal of a format corresponding to a destination device of the received remote control signal. The decoder 26 then transmits the converted remote control signal to the corresponding destination device. See Garr, column 5, lines 5 to 25.

In its rejection of Claim 17, the Office Action equated the claimed second controlled apparatus with the controlled devices 16 and 20 of Garr. However, Garr does not teach that an operating state of the controlled devices 16 and 20 can be checked. As a consequence, Garr could not possibly describe that an operating state of the second controlled apparatus is checked before the control command is transmitted to the second controlled apparatus.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 17, 22 and 27 as amended are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 82061v1